

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-7, 9-19 and 21-24 are now present in the application. Claims 1-7, 9-19 and 21-24 have been amended. Claims 8 and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 8-10 and 20-22 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the subject matter of allowable dependent claims 8 and 20, as discussed hereinbelow.

### **Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119**

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

### **Information Disclosure Citation**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 27, 2004 and July 18, 2007, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 forms filed therewith.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner did not indicate whether or not the formal drawings have been accepted. Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1-24 have been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under Obviousness-type Double Patenting**

Claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,261,131. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the subject matter that has not been identified in all instances, for example, the subject matter of dependent claims 8 and 20, respectively.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that because this rejection is obviousness type rejection, the Examiner has failed to comply with the analysis requirement set forth by *Graham v. Deere*. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 11-19, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Levine, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,590. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to incorporate allowable dependent claims 8 and 20, and a portion of the intervening claims 6 and 18.

Applicants respectfully submit that although only a portion of the intervening claims 6 and 18 has been respectively incorporated in claim 1 and 13, it is still believed that amended claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Levine.

In addition, claims 2-7, 11, 12, 14-19, 23 and 24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 13, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from amended independent claims 1 and 13, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 11-19, 23 and 24 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

#### **Additional Cited References**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

#### **CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) months extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

